



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,251	12/02/2003	Ludwig Eberler	P03,0469	3538
7590	05/22/2007			
SCHIFF HARDIN & WAITE		EXAMINER		
Patent Department		MAYO, TARA L		
6600 Sears Tower		ART UNIT		
233 South Wacker Drive		PAPER NUMBER		
Chicago, IL 60606		3671		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		05/22/2007		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10726251	12/2/03	EBERLER ET AL.	P03,0469

EXAMINER

Tara L.. Mayo

ART UNIT

PAPER

3671

20070511

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The reply brief filed 18 April 2007 has been entered and considered. The application has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.



TARA L MAYO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
Art Unit: 3671

Reply Brief  
Noted  
JUL 1 2007

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

APPELLANTS' REPLY BRIEF

APPELLANTS: Eberler et al. CONFIRMATION NO. 3538  
SERIAL NO.: 10/726,251 GROUP ART UNIT: 3671  
FILED: December 2, 2003 EXAMINER: Tara L. Mayo  
TITLE: METHOD AND DEVICE FOR INSTALLING AND REMOVING A  
STRUCTURAL COMPONENT OF AN MR APPARATUS

**MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF- PATENTS**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

SIR:

In accordance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §41.41, Appellants herewith submit their Reply Brief in response to the Examiner's Answer dated February 21, 2007. This Reply Brief will reply to the statements of the Examiner in the Response to Argument section of the Examiner's Answer, beginning at page 9.

In response to Appellants' arguments that the combination of Heinold et al., Reimann and Carper et al. fails to teach a structural component that is separate from the patient support apparatus, the Examiner stated that the Heinold et al. reference teaches a structural component that is separate from the patient support apparatus, because the Examiner contends that the connection of the structural component and the patient supporting apparatus does not preclude them from being separate or individual members.

Appellants would agree with this statement of the Examiner if the alleged "connection" of the relevant components in the Heinold et al. reference was a type of connection that could be disassembled or even broken. Appellants submit, however,